

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 7-28 and 30-33 are currently pending. Claims 1-3, 7-28 and 31-33 stand rejected. Claim 30 has been objected to by the Office. Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and below remarks.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 7-28 and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 7-26 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over Williams (U.S. Pat. No. 5,429,582; hereinafter referred to as "Williams") in view of Shaw et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,918,869, hereinafter referred to as "Shaw"). In order to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the rejected claims must be obvious in light of the cited reference. Because Applicants' claims 1-3, 7-26 and 28 are not obvious in light of Williams in view of Shaw, Applicants traverse these rejections, at least for the following reasons.

Applicants independent claims 1, 18 and 26 recite, in relevant part, as amended, that the "...a plurality of treatment agents are releasably mated with an outer surface of the expandable surface member..." such that "*a first treatment agent begins delivery before a second treatment agent...*" as now recited in each of the independent claims. It is noted that Applicant has amended the claims in accordance with subject matter of claim 30, which was deemed to be allowable by the Examiner. Amendments were made only for the purposes of expediting allowance of the case, and not by way of agreement with the Examiner's position regarding the Williams and Shaw references.

Thus, in view of these amendments, and for at least the reason that the combination of references fails to disclose or suggest "...*a plurality of treatment agents are releasably mated with an outer surface of the expandable surface member...*" such that "*a first treatment agent begins delivery before a second treatment agent*", it is requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn, and the application be allowed to issue.

Claims 27 and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over Williams (U.S. Pat. No. 5,429,582; hereinafter referred to as "Williams") in

view of Shaw et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,918,869, hereinafter referred to as "Shaw") and further in view of Tam.

Neither Tam, Shaw nor Williams teach or suggest "*....a plurality of treatment agents are releasably mated with an outer surface of the expandable surface member...*" such that "*a first treatment agent begins delivery before a second treatment agent*". Thus claims 27, 31-33 are allowable for at least the reason that they depend upon an allowable claim. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn.

### Conclusion

In view of the above Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Office should have any questions or other issues to discuss, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned attorney.

November 19, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_/Lindsay G. McGuinness/\_\_\_\_\_  
Lindsay G. McGuinness, Registration No. 38,549  
Attorney for Applicant  
USPTO Customer No. 38732  
Hologic, Inc.  
250 Campus Drive  
Marlborough, MA 01752  
Tel: 781-999-7339  
Fax: 508-263-2959